UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/966,529 | 09/28/2001 | Morrie Gasser | EMC01-07(01042) | 4785 |

7590 09/29/2004

Barry W. Chapin, Esq.
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C.
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, MA 01581

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| ARSHAD, UMAR | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2174 | 3 |

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/966,529 | Applicant(s) GASSER ET AL. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Examiner Umar Arshad | Art Unit 2174 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 September 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9-28-01*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

Claim 28 is objected to because of the following informalities: it is dependent on itself. The Examiner interprets claim 28 to be dependent on claim 27. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 29-31 are objected to because of the following informalities: they are dependent on claim 28, which is incorrectly dependent on itself. The Examiner interprets claim 29-31 to be dependent on claim 27. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 34 is objected to because of the following informalities: it is dependent on itself. The Examiner interprets claim 34 to be dependent on claim 33. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 37 is objected to because of the following informalities: it is dependent on itself. The Examiner interprets claim 37 to be dependent on claim 36. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 5, 9, 15, 16, 18-20, 22, 26, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hamilton et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,559,860.

As per claim 1, Hamilton et al. ("Hamilton") teaches a computer system having a memory system and a display that displays a graphical user interface for management of system resources, a method comprising the steps of:

displaying a set of resource tasks in a task display area and concurrently displaying a set of resource objects in a resource display area (see fig. 11, item 150; fig. 13, item 142; and col. 12, line 49 – col. 13, line 1);

receiving a selection of at least two resource objects displayed within the resource display area upon which to apply a function associated with at least one resource task displayed in the task display area (see col. 13, lines 52 – 54);

applying the function associated with at least one resource task to resource data associated with each selected resource object to produce resource information for each selected resource object (see col. 13, lines 54 – 56); and

concurrently displaying the resource information for each selected resource object in at least one shared output display area such that a user of the computer system can simultaneously view the resource information for each selected resource object (see fig. 12, items 144, 154, 160 and 166; and col. 13, lines 56 – 64).

As per claim 2, Hamilton further teaches the method of claim 1 wherein in the step of applying, the function applied to resource data associated with each selected resource object is obtained by a step of: receiving a selection of at least one resource task, the at least one resource task having an associated function which the step of applying applies to at least one of each selected resource object to produce resource information as a result of the function (see col. 13, lines 52 – 64).

As per claim 3, Hamilton teaches the method of claim 2 wherein the step of applying the function comprises the steps of:

determining, for each of the at least one selected resource task, any use cases associated with that task that apply to any selected resource objects (see col. 8, lines 20 – 29); and

for each use case that applies to a selected resource object, applying an associated function of that use case to resource data associated with the selected resource object to which that use case applies in order to produce the resource information for that selected resource object (see col. 9, lines 37 – 55).

As per claim 5, Hamilton further teaches the method of claim 2 wherein:

the step of receiving a selection of at least one resource task comprises receiving a selection of at least two different resource tasks, each having at least one respective associated function;

wherein the step of applying applies each respective associated function of each of the at least two selected resource tasks to data associated with at least one of each selected resource object to produce resource information for each respective associated function for the resource objects to which that function is applied; and

wherein the step of concurrently displaying the resource information for each selected resource object concurrently displays resource information for each respective associated function for the resource objects to which that function is applied in respective shared output display areas, such that a user of the computer system can concurrently compare resource information produced from applying multiple functions associated with multiple resource tasks on multiple resource objects (see col. 13, lines 52 – 64 and col. 14, lines 15 – 22).

As per claim 9, Hamilton further teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the resource tasks are displayed on a left portion of the graphical user interface (see fig. 13, item 142), the resource objects are displayed in a center portion of the graphical user interface (see fig. 13, item 64), and the shared output display area displays the resource information in at least one view panel with the shared output display area on a right portion of the graphical user interface (see fig. 13, item 149).

As per claim 15, Hamilton further teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the step of concurrently displaying displays the resource information in a form including at least one of: text, a table, a graph, and a network topology map (see fig. 14).

As per claims 16, 18, 33, 35, 36, 38, and 39, they are of similar scope to claim 1 and are rejected under the same rational (see rejection above).

As per claims 19, 20, 22, 26, and 32, they are of similar scope to claims 2, 3, 5, 9, and 15, respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale (see rejection above).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,559,860 in view of O'Brien et al., U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. US 2002/0133561.

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Hamilton teaches the method of claim 3 (see rejection above). Hamilton does not teach the method of claim 3 wherein the resource objects represent entities with a storage area network and wherein the resource tasks represent systems management functions that can be carried out upon the entities with the storage area network.

O'Brien et al. ("O'Brien") teaches resource objects representing entities within a storage area network and resource tasks representing systems management functions that can be carried out upon the entities with the storage area network (see O'Brien, paragraphs 0019 – 0022).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of O'Brien with the method of Hamilton in order to provide improved storage and management of files.

As per claim 21, it is of similar scope to claim 4 and is rejected under the same rationale (see rejection above).

Claims 6-8 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,559,860 in view of Mical, U.S. Patent No. 5,714,971.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Hamilton teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Hamilton does no teach the method of claim 1 wherein the step of displaying a set of resource tasks in a task display area includes the steps of: displaying a plurality of task categories, each task category identifying a set of related resource tasks based upon a commonality between functions associated with each resource task in the set; receiving a selection of at least one task category from the plurality of task categories; and in response to receiving the selection of at least one task category, displaying the set of related resource tasks identified by the selection of at least one task category while hiding from display other sets of resource tasks identified by task categories that are not selected.

Mical teaches displaying a set of resource tasks in a task display area includes the steps of:

displaying a plurality of task categories, each task category identifying a set of related resource tasks based upon a commonality between functions associated with each resource task in the set;

receiving a selection of at least one task category from the plurality of task categories; and

in response to receiving the selection of at least one task category, displaying the set of related resource tasks identified by the selection of at least one task category while hiding from display other sets of resource tasks identified by task categories that are not selected (see fig. 4 and col. 8, lines 36 – 59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Mical with the method of Hamilton in order to provide an improved method of selecting tasks.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Hamilton and Mical teach the method of claim 6. Hamilton further teaches the method of claim 6 wherein the displayed set of related resource tasks identified by the selection of at least one task category includes at least one resource view task which a user of the computer system may select such that the step of applying the function associated with at least one resource task applies a view function associated with the resource view task to produce resource information in a view format allowing the user to graphically view the resource information (see fig. 11, item 48 and col. 12, lines 59 – 62)

As per claim 8, Hamilton further teaches the method of claim 1 wherein:

the step of concurrently displaying a set of resource objects hierarchically displays the set of resource objects in a r-source display area according to a resource object hierarchy that defines hierarchical relationships between certain of the resource objects, such that resource objects hierarchically related below other resource objects are hierarchically displayed below the other resource objects (see fig. 11, item 149 and col. 13, lines 6 – 10).

Hamilton does not teach wherein the step of receiving a selection of at least two resource objects comprises the steps of: receiving a selection of a first resource object within the hierarchical display of resource objects; and while maintaining the selection of the first resource object, receiving a selection of a second resource object within the hierarchical display of resource objects.

Mical teaches wherein the step of receiving a selection of at least two resource objects comprises the steps of:

receiving a selection of a first resource object within the hierarchical display of resource objects; and

while maintaining the selection of the first resource object, receiving a selection of a second resource object within the hierarchical display of resource objects (see col. 9, lines 16 – 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Mical with the method of Hamilton in order to provide an improved method of selecting multiple objects.

As per claims 23-25, they are of similar scope to claims 6-8, respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale (see rejection above).

Claims 10-14, 17, 27-31, 34, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,559,860 in view of Shalit et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,714,971.

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Hamilton teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Hamilton further teaches the method of claim 1 wherein at least one of the resource display area and the shared output display area include a view panel that includes at least one split panel function (see fig. 13, item 64). Hamilton does not teach wherein the method further comprises the steps of: receiving a selection of a split panel function for a view panel on the graphical user interface; and dividing the view panel into at least two view panels in response to receiving the selection of the split panel function.

Shalit et al. ("Shalit") teaches receiving a selection of a split panel function for a view panel on the graphical user interface; and dividing the view panel into at least two view panels in response to receiving the selection of the split panel function (see col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Shalit with the method of Hamilton in order to provide an improved method of browsing objects.

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, Hamilton and Shalit teach the method of claim 10 (see rejection above). Shalit further teaches the method of claim 10 wherein the split panel function is at least one of a horizontal split panel function and a vertical split panel function (see fig. 2d).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 10, Hamilton and Shalit teach the method of claim 10 (see rejection above). Shalit further teaches the method of claim 10 wherein the view panel for which the selection of the split panel function is received is a resource object view panel in the resource display area that contains a display of resource objects for selection by a user, and wherein the step of dividing creates two resource object view panels from which a user of the graphical user interface can select resource objects for application of functions associated with selected resource tasks (see fig. 2d; col. 4, lines 62 – 67; and col. 5, lines 19 – 24).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 10, Hamilton and Shalit teach the method of claim 10 (see rejection above). Shalit further teaches the method of claim 10 wherein the view panel for which the selection of the split panel function is received is a view panel in the shared output display area that contains a display of resource information, and wherein the step of dividing creates two view panels from which a user of the graphical user interface can select one view panel to be a target view panel for display of resource

information produced as a result of application of functions associated with selected resource tasks on selected resource objects (see fig. 2d and col. 4, line 62 – col. 5, line 24).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 10, Hamilton and Shalit teach the method of claim 10 (see rejection above). Hamilton further teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising the steps of:

receiving a selection of a view panel to operate as a target panel in the shared output display area on the graphical user interface (see col. 13, lines 33 – 42);

receiving a modification to a selection of one of:

the at least two resource objects displayed within the resource display area;

the at least one storage resource task displayed within the task display area;

applying the modification to the selection to produce resource information that is displayed within the target panel in the shared output display area (see col. 13, lines 52 – 64).

As per claims 17, 34, and 37, they are of similar scope to claim 14 and are rejected under the same rationale (see rejection above).

As per claims 27-31, they are of similar scope to claims 10-14, respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale (see rejection above).

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Umar Arshad whose telephone number is (703) 305-0329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

UA

Kristine Kincaid

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100